



ARCHIVES  
ARCHITECTURE

## MEMORANDUM

DATE: October 26, 2020

TO: Attn: Kristy L. Weis, Vice President & Principal Project Manager  
David J. Powers & Associates, Inc.  
1871 The Alameda Suite 200  
San José, CA 95126  
(via email)

RE: Addendum to the Supplemental Historic Preservation Guidelines Review  
Market Street Tower/"Block 8" Project Base Texture ("Veil") Revisions

FROM: Leslie A.G. Dill, Historic Architect

### INTRODUCTION

This memorandum provides supplemental design review for the Market Street Tower/"Block 8" Development Project in San José. The memorandum serves as an addendum to the previously prepared *Historic Resource Project Assessment* report from January 2019—based on a design package from September 2018—and the subsequent supplemental reviews based on revised designs. One previous supplemental review was dated June 15, 2020 and revised July 9, 2020; a second supplemental review was dated September 10, 2020 and revised September 11, 2020. This is the third supplemental review.

An updated set of architectural renderings was forwarded to Archives & Architecture October 22, 2020; the following analysis provides a summary of the review of the design with regard to the revised design's compatibility with the historic resources adjacent to and near the project site. The original report included analysis for two separate but associated projects. The subsequent reviews, including this one, address only the development of the Market Street Tower/"Block 8." Per the earlier reports, the Market Street Tower Project on Block 8 is on the north side of West San Carlos Street between South Market and South First Streets. The project is addressed as 282 South Market St., and its Assessor Parcel Number is 259-42-080.

The most recent design revisions are presented in a five-page set of renderings titled *Market Street Towers, Revealed Corner Articulation Design (block 8 San Jose, California)* dated October 21, 2020. The design versions have been prepared by Arquitectonica for the owner, The Sobrato Organization, and forwarded electronically by David J. Powers & Associates, Inc. for review.

### **Executive Summary:**

The currently proposed Market Street Tower/"Block 8" Project remains substantially compatible with the surrounding historic properties. The proposed project's revised design does not adversely impact the Plaza de César Chávez/Market Plaza, the Westin San José/St. Claire Hotel, the St. Claire Apartments/St. Clair Building, the Dohrman Building/Trinkler-Dohrman Building, the Valley Title Building/Hale's Department Store, the Twohy Building, or the Four Points by Sheraton/Montgomery Hotel, either directly or indirectly or by cumulative effect with other projects. Analysis is provided, but the most recent conclusions are not revised. The integrity of these historic resources would be preserved.

### **SUPPLEMENTAL PROJECT DESCRIPTION (REVISIONS)**

The October proposal illustrates increased visibility of the scoring within the "veil" elements, as well as more highly textured surface. The top corners of the solid elements are shown more deeply concealed by the glazed curtain walls.

### **SUPPLEMENTAL PROJECT REVIEW**

This review confirms and updates the previous analyses. These reviews utilized the 2004 Draft *San José Downtown Historic Guidelines* and the 2019 *San José Downtown Design Guidelines and Standards*, as well as addressing the potential for cumulative effects. The conclusions of the report are incorporated into the Integrity Analysis at the end of this memorandum.

### **2004 DOWNTOWN HISTORIC DESIGN GUIDELINES**

The previous 2004 Downtown Historic Design Guideline analyses that are not affected by the revised texture revisions at the "veil" elements are not reviewed again. These guidelines include the following:

- *Lot Patterns (1)*
- *Massing (2)*
- *Corner Elements (4)*
- *Rear Facades (5)*
- *Entries (6)*
- *Vehicular and Pedestrian Access (8)*

The design review guidelines that are affected by the revisions are updated in this supplementary memorandum. These include the following guidelines:

- *Facades (3)*
- *Exterior Materials (7)*

### ***FACADES (3) – Updated Analysis from September 2020***

**Updated Analysis:** The revised design includes additional "articulation in form, material, and detailing..." at the base of the building where it is needed to provide pedestrian scale compatible with the subarea. The newly revised design includes panels of additionally textured

precast material within the curved areas, which previously related moderately in textural scale and overall size with the masonry of the historic buildings. The revised horizontal texture and scoring more closely relates the proposed building in scale with the surrounding historic buildings.

The currently proposed project, with its more highly textured and scored “veil” elements and its enhanced pedestrian-scaled streetscape, can still be found compatible with the Façades Guideline.

### *EXTERIOR MATERIALS (7) – Updated Analysis from July 2020*

**Updated Analysis:** The previously reviewed design was analyzed and found compatible with the historic Exterior Materials Guideline, and the revised design remain compatible. The October 2020 renderings illustrate revisions that can continue to be found compatible with the scale and depth of the historic materials per the analysis in the Façades Guideline. The revisions to the textured panels augment and continue to provide a solid element with a repetitive scale reminiscent of masonry of the historic masonry buildings.

The currently proposed project, with its revised recessed “veil” materials and upper corner design, can continue to be found compatible with the Exterior Materials Guideline.

## **2019 DOWNTOWN DESIGN GUIDELINES AND STANDARDS**

The previous 2019 Downtown Design Guidelines & Standards analyses that are not affected by the revised “veil” texture and scale are not reviewed again. These guidelines include the following:

- *GUIDELINE 4.2.2 – Massing Relationship to Context*
- *GUIDELINE 4.2.3 – Civic Icon Adjacency*
- *GUIDELINE 4.2.4 – Historic Adjacency (1) Massing*
- *GUIDELINE 4.2.4 – Historic Adjacency (2) Façade*
- *GUIDELINE 4.2.4 – Historic Adjacency (4) Ground Floor [pedestrian entries and ground floor ceiling height].*

The design review guidelines that are affected by the revisions—and were reviewed again for this memorandum—include the following:

- *GUIDELINE 4.2.4 – Historic Adjacency (3) Elements [materials]*

### *GUIDELINE 4.2.4 – HISTORIC ADJACENCY*

#### **(3) Elements [materials] – Updated analysis from July 2020**

- a) *Use some building materials that respond to Historic Context Buildings*

**Updated Analysis:** The upper-level proposed building materials have not been revised, and they are not reviewed again. The revised material texture, scale, and coloration of the solid “veil” element continue to respond to the solid masonry or stucco historic resources in the context area. The previous review of this design element concluded that it was compatible with the surrounding historic masonry buildings. The current proposal illustrates a texture and scoring that are enhance the compatibility in scale of the surface texturing and visual effect of the scoring. The upper corners of the “veil” elements, with their revised wall

relationship with the curtain wall provides a clearer representation of the “peeled away” design concept, enhancing the relationship of the solid base with its surrounding neighbors.

The revised proposed design remains compatible with the Elements Guideline.

b) *The new materials should be compatible with historic materials in scale, proportion, design, finish, texture, and durability.*

**Updated Analysis:** The proposed new building is currently proposed to have materials that are compatible in scale, proportion, design, finish, texture, and durability with the adjacent historic buildings. The recessed “veil” elements are illustrated as having an enhanced smaller-scale repetitive texture and an increased solidity in appearance, compatible with the surrounding historic masonry designs. The remaining design features have not been revised and are not re-analyzed.

The proposed project continues to be compatible with this aspect of the Standards.

The proposed project can be found to meet the intent of the **Elements Standards** (a and b).

## CUMULATIVE IMPACT ANALYSIS

Per the previous supplemental report, the most recently proposed project revisions do not change the cumulative impact analysis. The change in wall textures does not impact the patterns of development; how the proposed project relates to these patterns, or change the analysis with regard to the positive or negative impact of the project on the surrounding area.

## UPDATED INTEGRITY ANALYSIS

As analyzed above, the currently proposed project design can still be found to be substantially consistent with the San José Guidelines with regard to “infill” projects in the downtown. This indicates that the design of the project has a size, massing, scale, function, and materials generally compatible with the historic buildings in the immediate area.

Using this updated analysis, further conclusions can be revisited regarding the potential impact of a proposed project on nearby historic resources. For the basis of historic integrity analysis or definitions, see the July supplemental memorandum. The updated analysis continues to utilize the seven aspects of historic integrity indicated by the National Register and State of California’s definition of authenticity of a resource. Some of the aspects of integrity cannot be applied to projects on parcels adjacent to historic resources, including the aspects of location, artisanship, and materials because these aspects are not proposed for alteration of separate properties. For the purposes of understanding the impacts of a proposed project on a neighboring property, the aspects of design, setting, feeling, and association can be reviewed.

### Design

The project as revised would not have a direct physical impact on the integrity of the designs of any of the historic resources. Because the historic resources are adjacent to and near the project, rather than sharing the site, the designs of the buildings on nearby parcels would remain physically untouched. With regard to the visual understanding of the design, the updated analyses using the 2004 Draft *City of San José Downtown Historic Design Guidelines* and the 2019

*San José Downtown Design Guidelines and Standards* indicate that the size, massing, patterns of entrances, materials, scale, detailing, and separation of the buildings would be compatible; therefore, the historic designs of the Montgomery Hotel, the Twohy Building, the St. Claire Hotel and St. Claire Apartments, and the Dohrman Building, as well as the design understood to be encapsulated in the Hale's Department Store building, would not be overwhelmed, diminished, or made to appear out of scale or balance. Therefore, the integrity of the designs of the historic resources would continue to be preserved.

### **Setting**

Previous reviews indicate that the design of the proposed new building, with an emphasis on the lower levels that responds to the heights, scales, and materials of the historic commercial buildings, creates a compatible pedestrian setting. The proposed revisions at the project's lower levels, because they are more closely compatible with the textures and forms of the historic context, do not change this conclusion.

### **Feeling**

Previous reviews indicated that each historic building in the area has its own feeling that embodies a commercial mid-rise building of its era. Each building in the area is distinctive and conveys strong connotations. Each can "hold its own" in contrast with and adjacent to a project that conveys a feeling of twenty-first-century modernism. The integrity of feeling of the historic resource would continue to be preserved.

### **Association**

The associations of the historic buildings will continue to be represented adjacent to and nearby the proposed new construction. The new construction, with its modified base texturing and wall forms, would not diminish the architectural beauty or historic narratives that are embodied in these landmarks. As per the previous reviews, the historic integrity of the significance of each resource will be preserved.

### **Conclusions**

Although the setting would be altered, the historic setting had been previously lost with regard to the significance of the resources over time; the adjacent design, as currently revised, is compatible in scale and detailing at the streetscape; the feelings and associations of the historic resources would remain intact. Therefore, the proposed construction of the Market Street Tower/"Block 8" Project would not impact the historic integrity of the resources in the area.

## **CONCLUSIONS**

The revised proposed Market Street Tower/"Block 8" Project can continue be found to be substantially compatible with the 2004 Draft *City of San José Downtown Historic Design Guidelines* and the 2019 *City of San José Downtown Design Guidelines and Standards* for properties adjacent to Historic Context Buildings and in its Downtown subarea. It can be determined that it does not create an adverse cumulative impact with recent, current, and future development activity in the area. The historic integrity of the immediately surrounding historic resources can be found to be preserved.